

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the above-identified application. Support for the changes to claims 1-4 is found primarily on pages 5-6 of the specification. Support for new claims 5-17 is found primarily at pages 6-9 of the specification.

Issues Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 2-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite because of the absence of a definition for the phrase "maximum dimension".

In response to the above-noted rejection, claims 2-4 have been amended so as to define the phrase "maximum dimension". Consequently, it is submitted that all of the presently pending claims satisfy all definiteness requirements under 35 U.S.C. 112 such that the above-noted rejection should be withdrawn.

Issues Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oka '677 (USP 4,813,677). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Distinctions Between Present Invention and Oka '677

Oka '677 discloses a golf ball having a plurality of different kinds of dimples. Oka '677 discloses in Figure 12 a dimple having dimple edges **6** and a diameter **E** with a depth **n** extending from the lowest point **9** to an imaginary spherical surface **8**.

Oka '677 fails to disclose or suggest a golf ball having dimples with an outer region with a mean width of 0.03 mm to 0.20 mm as in the golf ball of the present invention. Thus, significant patentable distinctions exist between the present invention and Oka '677 such that the above-noted rejection should be withdrawn.

It is submitted for the reasons stated above that the present claims define patentable subject matter such that this application should now be placed condition for allowance.

If any questions arise regarding the above matters, please contact Applicant's representative, Andrew D. Meikle (Reg. No. 32,868), in the Washington Metropolitan Area at the phone number listed below.

Pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), the Applicants hereby petition for an extension of two (2) months to August 9, 2004, in which to file a reply to the Office Action. The required fee of \$420.00 is enclosed herewith.

Appl. No. 10/608,646
Attorney Docket Number 3673-0151P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By _____


Andrew D. Meikle, #32,868

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

ADM:gmh
3673-0151P